

# **California Board of Registered Nursing**

## **2009-2010 Annual School Report**

---

Data Summary for Pre-Licensure Nursing Programs

February 9, 2011

Prepared by:  
Tim Bates, MPP  
Dennis Keane, MPH  
Joanne Spetz, PhD  
Center for the Health Professions  
University of California, San Francisco  
3333 California Street, Suite 410  
San Francisco, CA 94118



## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>PREFACE .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>DATA SUMMARY – Pre-Licensure Programs .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Newly Enrolled Nursing Students .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Students who Completed a Nursing Program .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Faculty Data .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Nursing Program Data.....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>School Data.....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>APPENDIX A – List of Survey Respondents by Degree Program .....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>APPENDIX B – Definition List .....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>APPENDIX C – BRN Education Advisory Committee Members .....</b>	<b>41</b>

## **PREFACE**

### **Nursing Education Survey Background**

Development of the 2009-2010 Board of Registered Nursing (BRN) School Survey was the work of the Board's Education Advisory Committee (EAC), which consists of nursing education stakeholders from across California. A list of the EAC members is included in the Appendices. The University of California, San Francisco was commissioned by the BRN to develop the online survey instrument, administer the survey, and report data collected from the survey.

Funding for this project was provided by the California Board of Registered Nursing.

### **Organization of Report**

The survey collects data about nursing programs and their students and faculty from August 1 through July 31. Annual data presented in this report represent August 1, 2009 through July 31, 2010. Demographic information and census data were requested for October 15, 2010.

Data from pre- and post-licensure nursing education programs are presented in separate reports and will be available on the BRN website. Data are presented in aggregate form and describe overall trends in the areas and over the times specified and, therefore, may not be applicable to individual nursing education programs.

Statistics for enrollments and completions represent two separate student populations. Therefore, it is not possible to directly compare enrollment and completion data.

Data collected for the first time on 2009-2010 survey are identified by the symbol (‡). The reliability of these new data will be reviewed and considered for continued inclusion in future surveys.

### **Availability of Data**

The BRN Annual School Survey was designed to meet the data needs of the BRN as well as other interested organizations and agencies. A database with aggregate data derived from the 2000-2001 through 2009-2010 BRN School Surveys will be available for public access on the BRN website. Parties interested in accessing data not available on the website should contact the BRN.

The BRN acknowledges that survey respondents may not have had ready access to some of the data that were being requested. To address this issue, a member of the EAC developed a computer program for tracking most of the required data. The computer tracking program was distributed to nursing programs in the fall of 2006. Nursing programs that do not have this program may contact the BRN.

## **Value of the Survey**

This survey has been developed to support nursing, nursing education and workforce planning in California. The Board of Registered Nursing believes that the results of this survey will provide data-driven evidence to influence policy at the local, state, federal and institutional levels.

The BRN extends appreciation to the Education Advisory Committee and all survey respondents. Your participation has been vital to the success of this project.

## DATA SUMMARY – Pre-Licensure Programs

### *Number of California Nursing Programs*

- 61.9% of pre-licensure nursing programs in California are ADN programs.

Program Type	#	%
ADN	77	55.4 %
LVN to ADN	9	6.5%
BSN	37	26.6%
ELM	16	11.5%
Sum of Pre-Licensure Programs*	139	100.0%

\*Since some nursing schools have more than one nursing degree program, the number of nursing programs is greater than the number of nursing schools (n=125) in the state.

## Newly Enrolled Nursing Students

### *Ethnic Distribution of Newly Enrolled Nursing Students*

- 59.4% of students who enrolled in a pre-licensure nursing program for the first time were ethnic minorities.
- LVN to ADN programs continue to have a much higher percentage of ethnic minorities (78.5%) as newly enrolled nursing students.

Ethnicity	Program Type				
	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
	%	%	%	%	%
Native American	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%
Asian	13.2%	15.1%	19.3%	21.1%	15.7%
African American	6.7%	7.4%	4.4%	6.8%	6.0%
Filipino	13.8%	32.5%	16.8%	7.2%	15.4%
Hispanic	21.2%	16.0%	12.8%	16.7%	17.9%
White	41.0%	21.5%	42.6%	42.2%	40.6%
Other	3.5%	6.8%	3.4%	5.5%	3.7%
Total	7,276	636	4,393	711	13,016
Ethnic Minorities*	59.0%	78.5%	58.2%	57.8%	59.4%
# unreported or unknown	603	79	449	81	1,212

\*Ethnic minorities include Native American, Asian, African American, Filipino, Hispanic, and other.

*Gender Distribution of Newly Enrolled Nursing Students*

- 18.7% of students who enrolled in a pre-licensure program for the first time were male.
- ADN programs have the highest percentage of males among newly enrolled nursing students.

Gender	Program Type				
	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
	%	%	%	%	%
Male	19.2%	18.9%	18.6%	15.2%	18.7%
Female	80.8%	81.1%	81.7%	84.8%	81.3%
Total	7,772	708	4,830	765	14,075
# unreported or unknown	107	7	12	27	153

*Age Distribution of Newly Enrolled Nursing Students*

- 64.6% of students who enrolled in a pre-licensure nursing program were younger than 31 years of age when starting the program.

Age	Program Type				
	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
	%	%	%	%	%
<26 years	29.8%	23.6%	59.6%	30.2%	39.7%
26 - 30 years	25.9%	30.9%	20.3%	38.3%	24.9%
31 - 40 years	28.8%	27.0%	14.2%	18.9%	23.2%
41 - 50 years	12.5%	14.8%	4.3%	10.2%	9.7%
51 - 60 years	2.7%	3.5%	1.4%	2.2%	2.2%
>60 years	0.3%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%
Total	7,462	715	4,634	725	13,536
# unreported or unknown	417	0	208	67	692

*Newly Enrolled Students by Degree Type*

- The majority (55.4%) of students who enrolled in a pre-licensure nursing program for the first time continue to be generic ADN students.

Program Type	% Students
ADN	55.4%
LVN to ADN	5.0%
BSN	34.0%
ELM	5.6%
Total	14,228

*Newly Enrolled Students by Program Track*

- 66% of all newly enrolled nursing students are in the generic program track.
- 41.8% of BSN students are enrolled in an accelerated track.

Program Track	Program Type				
	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
	%	%	%	%	%
Generic	78.8%	0%	49.8%	99.9%	66.0%
Advanced Placement	13.3%	99.4%	2.6%	0%	13.3%
Transfer	1.6%	0.0%	5.8%	0.1%	2.9%
30-Unit Option	0.3%	0.6%	0.1%	0.0%	0.2%
Accelerated	6.0%	0.0%	41.8%	0.0%	17.6%
Total	7,879	715	4,842	792	14,228

*Qualified Applications Accepted and Not Accepted for Admission to Nursing Schools in California*

- 65.5% of the 41,105 qualified applications to pre-licensure nursing education programs received in 2009-2010 were *not* accepted for admission. Since these data represent applications and an individual can apply to multiple nursing programs, the number of applications is presumably greater than the number of individuals applying for admission to nursing programs in California.
- ADN and ELM programs had the highest percentage of qualified applications *not* accepted for admission.

	Program Type				
	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
Qualified Applications*	27,426	1,129	10,151	2,399	41,105
% Accepted	28.6%	63.3%	47.7%	31.9%	34.6%
% Not Accepted	71.4%	36.7%	52.3%	68.1%	65.4%

\* Since the data represent applications rather than individuals, the increase in qualified applications does not represent an equivalent growth in individuals applying to nursing school.

*Percentage of Nursing Student Admission Spaces Filled*

- As in recent years, overall, pre-licensure nursing programs admitted more students in 2009-2010 than the number of admission spaces that were available.
- 66 pre-licensure programs (47.5% of total) reported that they filled more admission spaces than were available.
- The most frequently reported reasons for doing so were to account for attrition and to make use of grant or donor funding.<sup>‡</sup>

	Program Type				
	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
Spaces Available	6,882	913	4,200	802	12,797
Spaces Filled	7,879	715	4,842	792	14,228
% Spaces Filled	114.5%	78.3%	115.3%	98.8%	111.2%

<sup>‡</sup> Data were collected for the first time in the 2009-2010 survey.

*Nursing Student Admission Spaces Supported by Donor Partners and Grants*

- 19% (n=2,426) of admission spaces to pre-licensure nursing programs were supported by either donor partners or grants.
- In general, grant funding plays a bigger role in supporting admission space compared with donor support, particularly in ADN programs. In 2009-2010 29.2% (n=2,005) of total admission spaces in generic ADN programs were supported by either donor partners or grants, but 78.5% of these 2,005 supported spaces were the result of grant funding.

	Program Type				
	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
Spaces Available	6,882	913	4,200	802	12,797
% Spaces Supported by Donor Partners	6.3%	1.1%	5.1%	0%	5.1%
% Spaces Supported by Grants	22.9%	7.1%	2.0%	6.2%	13.8%

*Nursing Student Census Data*

- On October 15, 2010, a total of 25,719 nursing students were enrolled in a California nursing program that leads to RN licensure.
- 51.7% of these nursing students were enrolled in a generic ADN program.

Census Data	Program Type				
	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
Nursing Students	13,303	708	10,242	1,466	25,719



## Students who Completed a Nursing Program

### *Ethnic Distribution of Students who Completed a Nursing Program in California*

- 58.7% of students who completed a pre-licensure nursing program were ethnic minorities.
- LVN to ADN programs continue to have the greatest share of ethnic minorities (81%) among students who completed a nursing program.

Ethnicity	Program Type				
	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
	%	%	%	%	%
Native American	0.8%	0.5%	0.6%	0.6%	0.8%
Asian	14.1%	26.1%	20.3%	21.6%	17.2%
African American	5.3%	9.4%	4.3%	6.3%	5.5%
Filipino	14.2%	25.9%	11.5%	8.0%	14.2%
Hispanic	20.6%	15.4%	12.1%	11.0%	17.4%
White	41.5%	19.0%	47.1%	48.7%	41.3%
Other	3.5%	3.8%	4.1%	3.7%	3.7%
Total	6,182	955	2,693	616	10,446
Ethnic Minorities*	58.5%	81.0%	52.9%	51.3%	58.7%
# unreported or unknown	525	28	464	49	1066

\*Ethnic minorities include Native American, Asian, African American, Filipino, Hispanic, and other.

### *Gender Distribution of Students who Completed a Nursing Program*

- 17.2% of all students who completed a pre-licensure nursing program were male.
- A greater share of males completed LVN to ADN and ADN programs by comparison with ELM and BSN programs.

Gender	Program Type				
	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
	%	%	%	%	%
Male	18.4%	20.3%	14.4%	14.1%	17.2%
Female	81.6%	79.7%	85.6%	85.9%	82.8%
Total	6,536	983	3,146	665	11,330
# unreported or unknown	171	0	11	0	182

*Age Distribution of Students who Completed a Nursing Program*

- 61.8% of students who completed a pre-licensure nursing program in 2009-2010 were younger than 31 years of age when they completed the program.
- The highest share of students who were at least 41 years of age were in LVN to ADN, and ADN programs (19.3% and 15.1% respectively).
- More than half (53.7%) of the students who completed a BSN program were younger than 26 years of age, compared to 32.3% of all students.

Age	Program Type				
	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
	%	%	%	%	%
<26 years	26.9%	17.3%	53.7%	19.4%	32.3%
26 - 30 years	29.3%	32.7%	25.1%	45.9%	29.5%
31 - 40 years	28.7%	30.8%	14.7%	25.3%	25.2%
41 - 50 years	12.6%	15.0%	5.1%	7.3%	10.6%
51 - 60 years	2.4%	4.1%	1.2%	2.1%	2.3%
>60 years	0.1%	0.2%	0.3%	0.0%	0.2%
Total	6,283	961	2,612	573	10,429
# unreported or unknown	424	22	545	92	1,083

*Student Completions by Degree Type*

- ADN programs are the largest segment of pre-licensure nursing programs and two-thirds of all students who completed a pre-licensure nursing program in 2009-2010 (66.8%) were ADN students.

Program Type	% Students
ADN	58.3%
LVN to ADN	8.5%
BSN	27.4%
ELM	5.8%
Total	11,512

*Student Completions by Program Track*

- 67.1% of nursing students completed nursing programs in the generic program track.
- BSN programs had the highest share of students (20.9 %) complete the program in an accelerated track.

Program Track	Program Type				
	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
	%	%	%	%	%
Generic	71.4%	0.0%	72.2%	99.2%	67.1%
Advanced Placement	14.1%	98.8%	1.4%	0.0%	17.1%
Transfer	1.1%	0.0%	4.8%	0.6%	2.0%
30-Unit Option	0.8%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.5%
Readmitted	6.9%	1.0%	0.6%	0.2%	4.3%
Accelerated	5.8%	0.0%	20.9%	0.0%	9.1%
Total	6,707	983	3,157	665	11,512

*Completion, Retention and Attrition Data*

- The overall attrition rate for pre-licensure nursing education programs in California was 13.9% in 2009-2010.

<b>Retention and Attrition</b>	<b>Program Type</b>				
	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
Students Scheduled to Complete the Program	6,228	665	2,556	731	10,180
Completed On-time	4,593	472	2,198	582	7,845
Still Enrolled	541	146	150	88	925
Dropped Out	1,094	47	208	61	1,410
Completed Late <sup>‡</sup>	433	62	98	22	615
Retention Rate*	73.7%	71.0%	86.0%	79.6%	77.1%
Attrition Rate	17.6%	7.1%	8.1%	8.3%	13.9%

\*Retention rate = (students who completed the program on-time) / (students scheduled to complete the program)

- The attrition rate for accelerated tracks within nursing programs was 6.1% in 2009-2010.
- Accelerated BSN programs had the lowest attrition rate at 5.8%.

<b>Accelerated Track Retention and Attrition</b>	<b>Program Type<sup>†</sup></b>		
	ADN	BSN	Total
Students Scheduled to Complete the Program	468	691	1,159
Completed On-time	421	638	1,059
Still Enrolled	16	13	29
Dropped Out	31	40	71
Completed Late <sup>‡</sup>	22	23	45
Retention Rate*	90.0%	92.3%	91.4%
Attrition Rate	6.6%	5.8%	6.1%

\*Retention rate = (students who completed the program on-time) / (students scheduled to complete the program)

<sup>†</sup>LVN to ADN and ELM programs are excluded since (1) none of these programs reported attrition data for the accelerated track and (2) they can be considered accelerated by definition.

---

<sup>‡</sup> Data were collected for the first time in the 2009-2010 survey. These completions are not included in the calculation of either the retention or attrition rates.

*Factors Impacting Student Attrition*

- Academic failure and personal reasons continue to be reported as the factors with the greatest impact on student attrition.
- About 50% (n=63) of nursing schools reported that academic failure had the greatest impact on student attrition, while 28% (n=35) of schools reported that personal reasons had the greatest impact on student attrition.

<b>Factors Impacting Student Attrition</b>	<b>Average Rank*</b>
Academic failure	1.7
Personal reasons(e.g. home, job, health, family)	2.2
Clinical failure	2.6
Financial need	2.9
Change of major or career interest	3.7
Transfer to another school	3.8

\*The lower the ranking, the greater the impact on attrition (1 has the greatest impact on attrition, while 8 has the least impact).

## Faculty Data

Analysis of faculty data by degree type is not available because the faculty data are reported by school, not by degree type.

### *Full-time and Part-time Faculty Data*

- On October 15, 2010, there were 3,741 nursing faculty. The majority are part-time faculty (61.6%, n=2,306).
- 84 schools reported that their full-time faculty worked an overloaded schedule in 2009-2010, and 90.5% of these schools reported paying extra for the overloaded schedule.
- The faculty vacancy rate in pre-licensure nursing programs is 5.0% (196 vacant positions total).
- There were more full-time than part-time faculty vacancies reported, resulting in a higher vacancy rate among full-time faculty.

	# Faculty	Faculty Vacancies	Vacancy Rates
Total faculty	3,741	196	5.0%
Full-time faculty	1,435	126	8.1%
Part-time faculty	2,306	70	2.9%

- More than half of the faculty reported (54.5%) teach only clinical courses while 37% teach a combination of both clinical and didactic courses.

Teaching Assignment	% Faculty
Clinical courses only	54.5%
Didactic courses only	8.4%
Clinical & didactic courses	37.0%
Total faculty (number)	3,741

### Faculty Hiring

- 100 schools reported hiring a total of 546 faculty members between August 1, 2009 and July 31, 2010, representing 355 FTEs<sup>‡</sup>.
- 39.9% (n=218) of these newly hired faculty had less than one year of teaching experience before they took the faculty position.
- The majority of schools (57%) that hired a faculty person in the last year reported that their newly hired faculty had prior experience teaching in nursing.
- 32% of schools that hired a new faculty member last year reported that the new hire had no previous teaching experience.
- 38 schools reported they were under a hiring freeze for active faculty at some point between August 1, 2009 and July 31, 2010. Data reflects that some of these schools may have also been able to hire at some point during this timeframe.<sup>‡</sup>

Characteristics of Newly Hired Faculty	% Schools
Completed a graduate degree program in last two years	61%
Experience teaching at another nursing school	57%
Experience teaching as a nurse educator in a clinical setting	55%
Experience student teaching while in graduate school <sup>‡</sup>	45%
No teaching experience <sup>‡</sup>	32%
Experience teaching in a setting outside of nursing	22%
Number of schools that hired faculty	100

- The most frequently reported reason for hiring faculty was to replace faculty that had retired or left the program (75%).
- Less than half (39%) of the schools that hired faculty reported that the hiring was due to program expansion.

Reasons for Hiring Faculty	% Schools
To replace faculty that retired or left the program	75%
Due to program expansion	39%
To reduce faculty workload	23%
To fill longstanding faculty vacancies (positions vacant for more than one year)	18%
Number of schools that hired faculty	100

---

<sup>‡</sup> Data were collected for the first time in the 2009-2010 survey.

*Faculty Attrition*

- 93 schools reported a total of 135 full-time and 193 part-time faculty members as having retired or left the program in 2009-2010.
- Programs reported an additional 84 faculty members are expected to retire or leave the school in 2010-2011.
- The most frequently cited reason for having a faculty member leave the program in 2009-2010 was retirement.<sup>‡</sup>

<b>Reasons for Faculty Leaving</b>	<b>% Schools</b>
Retirement	43.2%
Relocation of spouse or other family obligation	23.5%
Termination (or requested resignation)	22.2%
Return to clinical practice	19.8%
Salary/Benefits	16.0%
Career advancement	13.6%
Workload	6.2%
Layoffs (for budgetary reasons)	3.7%
Number of schools reporting	81
Number of schools that gave no reason	12

---

<sup>‡</sup> Data describing reasons for faculty leaving were collected for the first time in the 2009-2010 survey.

*Faculty Demographic Data*

- Nursing faculty continue to be predominately white (69.9%) and female (91%).

<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>% Faculty</b>
Native American	0.5%
Asian	6.7%
African American	8.0%
Filipino	5.4%
Hispanic	7.4%
White	69.9%
Other	2.1%
Number of faculty	3,614
Ethnic Minorities*	30.1%
# unreported or unknown	127

\*Ethnic minorities include Native American, Asian, African American, Filipino, Hispanic, and other.

<b>Gender</b>	<b>% Faculty</b>
Male	9%
Female	91%
Number of faculty	3,675
# unreported or unknown	66

- 63.6% of faculty are between 40 and 59 years of age.

<b>Age</b>	<b>% Faculty</b>
<30 years	3.8%
30-39 years	18.7%
40-49 years	29.0%
50-59 years	34.6%
60+ years	13.9%
Number of faculty	3,325
# unreported or unknown	416

*Faculty Education*

- On October 15, 2010, 72.8% of all active faculty held a master's or doctoral degree.
- 9.4% of all active faculty (n=352) were reported as pursuing an advanced degree as of October 15, 2010.

<b>Highest Degree Held</b>	<b>% Faculty</b>
Associate degree	5.6%
Bachelor's degree	21.6%
Master's degree	60.9%
Doctoral degree	11.9%
Total faculty (number)	3,741
Number of faculty pursuing an advanced degree <sup>‡</sup>	352

---

<sup>‡</sup> Data were collected for the first time in the 2009-2010 survey.



*Methods Used to Prepare Part-time Faculty to Teach*

- Faculty orientations and program policies were the most frequently reported methods used to prepare part-time faculty to teach.

<b>Methods</b>	<b>% Schools</b>
Faculty orientation	90.3%
Program policies	86.3%
Mentoring program	76.6%
Specific orientation program	75.8%
Administrative policies	71.8%
Teaching strategies	63.7%
Curriculum review	62.1%
External training program	16.1%
Other	8.9%
None	0.8%
Number of schools	124

*Barriers to Recruiting Faculty*

- Insufficient number of faculty applicants with the required credentials and non-competitive salaries were reported as the most common barriers to recruiting faculty.
- 35% of schools reported that the workload responsibilities of being faculty were a barrier to recruitment.
- Fewer than 20% of schools felt that an overall RN shortage was a barrier to recruiting faculty.

<b>Barriers to Recruiting Faculty</b>	<b>% Schools</b>
Insufficient number of faculty applicants with required credentials	76.7%
Non-competitive salaries	68.3%
Workload (not wanting faculty responsibilities) <sup>‡</sup>	35.0%
Private, state university or community college laws, rules or policies	26.7%
BRN rules and regulations	23.3%
Overall shortage of RNs	19.2%
No barriers	7.5%
Other	5.9%
Number of schools	120

---

<sup>‡</sup> Data were collected for the first time in the 2009-2010 survey.

*Difficult to Hire Clinical Areas<sup>‡</sup>*

- Approximately one-half of schools reported finding it difficult to recruit new faculty to fill positions in Pediatrics (52.1%) and Psych/Mental Health (48.7%).
- 21% of schools reported they had no difficulty recruiting faculty for any clinical specialty area.

Clinical Area	% Schools
Pediatrics	52.1%
Psych/Mental Health	48.7%
Obstetrics/Gynecology	39.5%
Medical-surgical	30.3%
None	21.0%
Critical Care	15.1%
Geriatrics	8.4%
Community Health	5.9%
Other	2.5%
Number of schools	119

*Grant Funds Support for Teaching Salaries<sup>‡</sup>*

- 70.2% of schools (n=87) reported that grant funding supported the teaching salary of active faculty during the 2009-2010 academic year.
- 424 total faculty positions were supported by these grant funds.
- 67.1% of the 87 schools that reported grant support for teaching salaries this year indicated that the faculty positions would continue to be funded for the 2010-2011 academic year.
- 81.3% of the 16 schools that reported grant support for teaching salaries received this year would be lost in the 2010-2011 academic year indicated they would seek additional grant/donor funding.

*Donor Partner Funds Support for Teaching Salaries<sup>‡</sup>*

- 34.4% of schools (n=42) reported that donor partner support funded the teaching salary of active faculty during the 2009-2010 academic year.
- 194 total faculty positions were supported by these donor partner funds.
- 61.9% of the 42 schools that reported donor partner support for teaching salaries this year indicated that the faculty positions would continue to be funded for the 2010-2011 academic year.
- 50% of the 12 schools that reported donor partner support for teaching salaries received this year would be lost in the 2010-2011 academic year indicated that these teaching positions would be lost.

---

<sup>‡</sup> Data were collected for the first time in the 2009-2010 survey.

*Faculty Salaries*

- On average, full-time faculty with doctoral degrees earn more than those with master's degrees.

<b>Average Lowest Salary Paid for Full-Time Faculty by Degree Type</b>		
<b>Highest Degree Held by Faculty Member</b>	<b>\$/ Academic Year</b>	<b>\$/ Calendar Year</b>
Master's Degree	\$59,441	\$73,814
Doctoral Degree	\$70,096	\$79,133

<b>Average Highest Salary Paid for Full-Time Faculty by Degree Type</b>		
<b>Highest Degree Held by Faculty Member</b>	<b>\$/ Academic Year</b>	<b>\$/ Calendar Year</b>
Master's Degree	\$85,004	\$92,703
Doctoral Degree	\$95,636	\$116,591

## Nursing Program Data

### Program Offerings

- Overall, most nursing programs (84.4%, n=114) offered a traditional nursing program in 2009-2010
- Accelerated, evening, distance, and extended education programs were the most commonly reported non-traditional programs offered at nursing schools.
- Only 10% of programs that have an accelerated track offer it via distance education.

Program Offerings	Program Type				
	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
	%	%	%	%	%
Traditional Program	98.7%	44.4%	80.0%	38.5%	84.4%
Accelerated Track	6.5%	55.6%	31.4%	69.2%	22.4%
Evening Program	15.6%	0.0%	5.7%	15.4%	11.9%
Distance Education	6.5%	0.0%	17.1%	7.7%	9.0%
Extended Campus	10.4%	0.0%	8.6%	7.7%	9.0%
Weekend Program	11.7%	0.0%	0.0%	7.7%	7.5%
Contract Education	5.2%	0.0%	5.7%	0.0%	4.5%
Part-time Program	3.9%	0.0%	5.7%	0.0%	3.7%
Collaborative/Shared Education	1.3%	0.0%	2.9%	0.0%	1.5%
Other	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	7.7%	1.5%
Number of programs	77	9	36	13	135

### Frequency of Student Admission

- Although most nursing programs admit students twice per year, LVN to ADN and ELM programs typically admit students once per year.

Frequency of Student Admission	Program Type				
	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
	%	%	%	%	%
Once per year	27.3%	50.0%	30.6%	62.5%	33.6%
Twice per year	67.5%	0.0%	41.7%	18.8%	51.1%
Three times per year	5.2%	25.0%	8.3%	6.3%	7.3%
Other	0.0%	25.0%	19.4%	12.5%	8.3%
Number of programs	77	8	36	16	137

*Admission Criteria*

- Completion of prerequisite courses, minimum/cumulative grade point average (GPA), and minimum grade level in prerequisite courses were the most common criteria used to determine if an applicant was qualified for admission to the nursing program.
- Score on a pre-enrollment exam was also an important criterion for ADN, LVN to ADN, and BSN programs.
- Health-related work experience was more frequently used as a criterion among BSN and ELM programs

Admission Criteria	Program Type				
	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
	%	%	%	%	%
Completion of prerequisite courses	85.5%	77.8%	82.9%	87.5%	84.6%
Minimum/Cumulative GPA	78.9%	77.8%	88.6%	100.0%	83.8%
Minimum grade level in prerequisite courses	68.4%	66.7%	82.9%	81.3%	73.5%
Score on pre-enrollment exam	73.7%	88.9%	74.3%	31.3%	69.9%
Validated prerequisites	68.4%	66.7%	0.0%	0.0%	42.6%
Repetition of prerequisite science courses	43.4%	33.3%	34.3%	12.5%	36.8%
Health-related work experience	15.8%	11.1%	45.7%	50.0%	27.2%
Recent completion of prerequisite courses	23.7%	11.1%	31.4%	37.5%	26.5%
Community Colleges' Nursing Prerequisite Validation Study Composite Score	32.9%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	19.1%
Geographic location	3.9%	0.0%	28.6%	12.5%	11.0%
Criteria as defined in California Assembly Bill 1559	15.8%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	9.6%
Other	3.9%	22.2%	42.9%	37.5%	19.1%
None	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Number of programs	76	9	35	16	136

### Admission Selection Process

- Overall, ranking by specific criteria was the most common method for selecting students for admission to nursing programs.
- In ADN programs, random selection was the most common method of selecting students for admission, while ranking by specific criteria was the most common selection method for BSN and ELM programs.
- BSN and ELM programs more frequently reported using the interview as a selection criterion, and ELM programs were more likely to consider an applicant's goal statement.

Selection Criteria	Program Type				
	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
	%	%	%	%	%
Ranking by specific criteria	32.5%	50.0%	88.6%	93.8%	55.1%
Random selection	46.8%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	27.2%
Interviews	5.2%	12.5%	28.6%	68.8%	19.1%
First come, first served (waiting list)	20.8%	0.0%	2.9%	6.3%	13.2%
Goal statement	2.6%	12.5%	8.6%	62.5%	11.8%
First come, first served (based on application date for the quarter/semester)	3.9%	37.5%	5.7%	18.8%	8.1%
Modified random selection	10.4%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.4%
Other	6.5%	12.5%	17.1%	6.3%	9.6%
Number of programs	77	8	35	16	136

### Waiting List

- 10,771 applicants<sup>1</sup> to pre-licensure nursing programs were placed on a waiting list in 2009-2010.
- ADN programs reported the longest average waiting time (4.1 quarters/semesters) for applicants to enroll after being placed on a waiting list, while ELM programs and LVN to ADN programs have the shortest average waiting time (1.5 and 1.7 quarters/semesters, respectively).

Waiting Lists	Program Type				
	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
Qualified applicants* on a waiting list	9,977	383	279	132	10,771
Average number of quarters/semesters to enroll after being placed on the waiting list	4.1	1.7	3	1.5	3.5

\*Since applicants can apply to multiple nursing programs within the same application cycle, some applicants may be placed on multiple waiting lists. Therefore, the number of applicants on waiting lists may not represent an equal number of individuals.

<sup>1</sup> Since applicants can apply to multiple nursing programs within the same application cycle, some applicants may be placed on multiple waiting lists. Therefore, the number of applicants on waiting lists may not represent an equal number of individuals.

*Capacity of Program Expansion*

- Given current resources, nursing programs expect their new student enrollment to decline by 8.2% (n=1,173), from 14,228 in 2009-2010 to 13,055 in 2010-2011.
- Three LVN to ADN programs reported an expectation of zero new enrollments in the next two years, dramatically reducing projected LVN to ADN capacity.

Current and Projected New Student Enrollment	Program Type				
	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
2009-2010 new student enrollment	7,879	715	4,842	792	14,228
Expected new student enrollment given current resources					
2010-2011	6,867	289	5,009	890	13,055
2011-2012	6,821	322	5,117	963	13,223

*Barriers to Program Expansion*

- Lack of clinical sites is the most frequently reported barrier to program expansion, for all program types (reported by 80.6% of all programs).
- Insufficient funding for faculty salaries and noncompetitive faculty salaries, in addition to a lack of qualified classroom and clinical faculty were also frequently reported as barriers to program expansion.
- Only 3.6% of all programs reported no barriers to program expansion; 94.8% of programs reported at least one barrier to program expansion.

Barriers to Program Expansion	Program Type				
	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
	%	%	%	%	%
Insufficient number of clinical sites	83.1%	100%	70.3%	81.3%	80.6%
Insufficient funding for faculty salaries	54.5%	33.3%	45.9%	56.3%	51.1%
Faculty salaries not competitive	46.8%	55.6%	45.9%	37.5%	46.0%
Insufficient number of qualified classroom faculty	50.6%	33.3%	40.5%	25.0%	43.9%
Insufficient number of qualified clinical faculty	44.2%	44.4%	45.9%	31.3%	43.2%
Insufficient funding for program support (e.g. clerical, travel, supplies, equipment)	46.8%	11.1%	27.0%	12.5%	35.3%
Insufficient number of physical facilities and space for skills labs	28.6%	22.2%	21.6%	37.5%	27.3%
Insufficient number of physical facilities and space for classrooms	23.4%	22.2%	16.2%	25.0%	21.6%
Insufficient number of allocated spaces for the nursing program	20.8%	22.2%	16.2%	25.0%	20.1%
Insufficient support for nursing school by college or university	6.5%	11.1%	13.5%	6.3%	8.6%
Insufficient financial support for students	11.7%	22.2%	0.0%	0.0%	7.9%
Other	5.2%	11.1%	2.7%	0.0%	4.3%
No barriers to program expansion <sup>‡</sup>	1.3%	0.0%	5.4%	12.5%	3.6%
Number of programs	77	9	37	16	139

<sup>‡</sup> Data were collected for the first time in the 2009-2010 survey.

*Program Expansion Strategies*

- Of the programs that reported a lack of clinical sites as a barrier to program expansion, human patient simulators, evening, weekend and twelve-hour shifts, as well as community-based/ambulatory care centers, were the most frequently reported strategies used to address an insufficient number of clinical sites.
- Use of regional computerized clinical placement systems as a strategy was much more frequently reported by BSN and ELM programs than ADN programs.

Program Expansion Strategies	Program Type				
	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
	%	%	%	%	%
Human patient simulators	79.7%	88.9%	75.0%	61.5%	77.3%
Evening shifts	71.9%	77.8%	79.2%	76.9%	74.5%
Weekend shifts	70.3%	66.7%	75.0%	76.9%	71.8%
Twelve-hour shifts	67.2%	77.8%	75.0%	76.9%	70.9%
Community-based /ambulatory care (e.g. homeless shelters, nurse managed clinics, community health centers)	62.5%	44.4%	66.7%	92.3%	65.5%
Regional computerized clinical placement system	43.8%	55.6%	70.8%	69.2%	53.6%
Innovative skills lab experiences	48.4%	44.4%	50.0%	30.8%	46.4%
Preceptorships	34.4%	44.4%	50.0%	38.5%	39.1%
Night shifts	12.5%	0.0%	33.3%	46.2%	20.0%
Non-traditional clinical sites (e.g. correctional facilities)	9.4%	22.2%	20.8%	15.4%	13.6%
Other	9.4%	11.1%	4.2%	0.0%	7.3%
None	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Number of programs	64	9	25	13	111



*Clinical Space Restrictions<sup>‡</sup>*

- 77 programs reported being denied access to clinical space in 2009-2010 that had been available during the 2008-2009 academic year.
- Overall, the most frequently reported reasons for why programs were denied clinical space were competition for space arising from an increase in the number of nursing students in the region, being displaced by another program, and staff nurses at clinical sites being overloaded.

Reasons for Clinical Space Being Unavailable	Program Type				
	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
	%	%	%	%	%
Competition for Clinical Space due to Increase in Number of Nursing Students in Region	62.2%	80.0%	77.8%	100%	71.4%
Displaced by Another Program	57.8%	80.0%	61.1%	77.8%	62.3%
Staff Nurse Overload	44.4%	60.0%	72.2%	66.7%	54.5%
Clinical Facility Seeking Magnet Status	44.4%	80.0%	16.7%	11.1%	36.4%
Decrease in Patient Census	31.1%	40.0%	55.6%	11.1%	35.1%
Nursing Residency Programs	26.7%	40.0%	33.3%	22.2%	28.6%
No Longer Accepting ADN Students	37.8%	60.0%	0.0%	0.0%	26.0%
Other	24.4%	20.0%	11.1%	22.2%	20.8%
Number of programs	45	5	18	9	77

- Schools that reported being denied access to clinical space in 2009-2010 that had been available in the previous academic year, reported a total of 227 clinical placement sites lost.
- Schools reported that the loss of these clinical placement sites affected 2,312 students.
- Overall the most frequently reported clinical areas impacted by lost placement sites were Medical/Surgical, Psychiatry/Mental Health, Obstetrics and Pediatrics.<sup>‡</sup>

Clinical Area That Lost Placement Sites	Program Type				
	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
	%	%	%	%	%
Medical/Surgical	59.1%	100%	70.6%	44.4%	62.7%
Psychiatry/Mental Health	45.5%	60.0%	35.3%	33.3%	42.7%
Obstetrics	38.6%	40.0%	35.3%	44.4%	38.7%
Pediatrics	27.3%	80.0%	41.2%	33.3%	34.7%
Critical Care	20.5%	20.0%	29.4%	33.3%	24.0%
Geriatrics	6.8%	0.0%	17.6%	11.1%	9.3%
Community Health	2.3%	0.0%	5.9%	22.2%	5.3%
Other	18.2%	0.0%	17.6%	22.2%	17.3%
Number of programs	44	5	17	9	75

<sup>‡</sup> Data describing being denied access to clinical space and the areas affected were collected for the first time in the 2009-2010 survey.

*LVN to RN Education*

- Nine nursing programs exclusively offer LVN to ADN education.
- Of the 77 generic ADN programs, 37.7% (n=29) have a separate track for LVNs and 68.8% (n=53) admit LVNs to the generic ADN program on a space available basis.
- 33 of the generic ADN programs have a separate waiting list for LVNs.
- On October 15, 2010 there were a total of 1,091 LVNs on an ADN program waitlist. These programs reported that on average, it takes 3 quarters/semesters for an LVN-to-ADN student to enroll in the first nursing course after being placed on the waiting list.
- Overall, the most commonly reported mechanisms that facilitate a seamless progression from LVN to RN education are a bridge course and a skills lab course to document competencies.
- Direct articulation of LVN coursework and credit granted for LVN coursework upon completion of ADN courses are more frequently reported by LVN to ADN programs.

LVN to RN Articulation	Program Type			
	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	Total
Bridge course	89.3%	75.0%	40.9%	78.1%
Use of skills lab course to document competencies	60.0%	37.5%	45.5%	55.2%
Direct articulation of LVN coursework	41.3%	62.5%	36.4%	41.9%
Credit granted for LVN coursework following successful completion of a specific ADN course(s)	26.7%	50.0%	40.9%	31.4%
Use of tests (such as NLN achievement tests or challenge exams to award credit)	21.3%	12.5%	22.7%	21.0%
Specific program advisor	17.3%	25.0%	13.6%	17.1%
Other	17.3%	0.0%	13.6%	15.2%
Number of programs	75	8	22	105

*LVN to BSN Education*

- Three BSN programs reported LVN to BSN tracks that exclusively admit LVN students or differ significantly from the generic BSN program offered at the school.
  - These programs received 112 qualified applications for the 101 admission spaces available for LVN to BSN students.<sup>2</sup> 18 of these spaces were supported by grant funding.
  - All of these programs used completion of prerequisite courses, minimum GPA in these courses, as well as cumulative GPA as criteria for admission to the LVN to BSN program.

<b>LVN to BSN Admission Criteria</b>	<b># LVN to BSN Programs</b>
Completion of prerequisite courses	3
Minimum grade level in prerequisite courses	3
Minimum/Cumulative GPA	3
Repetition of prerequisite science courses	1
Geographic location	0
Recent completion of prerequisite courses	1
Health-related work experience	0
Other	1
None	0
Number of programs	3

- Ranking by specific criteria was reported by two of the three programs as a method for selecting students for admission to LVN to BSN programs.

<b>LVN to BSN Selection Criteria</b>	<b># LVN to BSN Programs</b>
Ranking by specific criteria	2
First come, first served (based on application date for the quarter/semester)	1
Goal statement	0
Interviews	0
First come, first served (waiting list)	0
Other	0
Number of programs	3

---

<sup>2</sup> Insufficient data on the number of qualified applications to LVN to BSN programs were received. Therefore, these data are not included.

*Partnerships*

- 35 nursing programs participate in collaborative or shared programs with another nursing program leading to a higher degree.

	Program Type				
	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
	# Programs	# Programs	# Programs	# Programs	# Programs
<b>Partnerships</b>					
Collaborative/shared programs leading to higher degree	28	2	5	0	35

*Professional Accreditation*

- None of the LVN to ADN programs and less than half (37.7%) of the ADN programs reported having NLNAC accreditation. CCNE does not accredit LVN to ADN or ADN programs.
- 91.9% (n=34) of BSN programs and 87.5% (n=14) of ELM programs have CCNE accreditation and are much more likely to have CCNE than NLNAC accreditation.

	Program Type				
	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
	% Programs	% Programs	% Programs	% Programs	% Programs
<b>Professional Accreditation</b>					
NLNAC	37.7%	0.0%	5.4%	6.25%	22.9%
CCNE	NA*	NA*	91.9%	87.5%	33.6%
Not accredited by NLNAC or CCNE	62.3%	100.0%	5.4%	6.25%	43.5%
Number of programs	77	9	37	16	139

\* NA – Not Applicable, CCNE does not accredit ADN programs.

*First Time NCLEX Pass Rates*

- In 2009-2010, 88.9% (n=9,857) of nursing students who took the NCLEX for the first time passed the exam.

	Program Type				
	ADN	LVN to ADN	BSN	ELM	Total
First Time NCLEX* Pass Rate	89.3%	83.9%	89.2%	89.0%	88.9%
# Students that took the NCLEX	6,686	877	3,084	446	11,093
# Students that passed the NCLEX	5,972	736	2,752	397	9,857

\*These data represent nursing students who took the NCLEX for the first time. Students who took the exam more than once in the five years preceding 2008-2009 are not included in these data.

- 88.7% (n=872) of nursing students in an accelerated track who took the NCLEX for the first time in 2009-2010 passed the exam.

<b>Accelerated Track</b>	Program Type**		
	ADN	BSN	Total
First Time NCLEX* Pass Rate	89.0%	88.5%	88.7%
# Students that took the NCLEX	382	601	983
# Students that passed the NCLEX	340	532	872

\*These data represent nursing students who took the NCLEX for the first time. Students who took the exam more than once in the five years preceding 2008-2009 are not included in these data.

\*\* No LVN to ADN or ELM programs reported data in this area.

## School Data

Data in this section represent all schools with pre-licensure nursing programs. Data were not reported by degree type. As a result, this breakdown is not available.

### *Methods Used to Increase Student Retention*

- Student success strategies such as mentoring, remediation, tutoring, and personal counseling were reported as the most common methods used to increase student retention.

<b>Methods Used to Increase Student Retention</b>	<b>% Schools</b>
Student success strategies (e.g. mentoring, remediation, tutoring)	98.4%
Personal counseling	81.1%
Program revisions (e.g. curriculum revisions)	57.4%
New admission policies instituted	51.6%
Increased financial aid	41.8%
Increased child care	7.4%
Other	18.0%
None	0%
Number of schools	122

### *Innovations Used to Expand the Nursing Program*

- Simulation training, use of adjunct faculty, and grants were reported as the most common methods used to expand the nursing program.

<b>Innovations Used to Expand the Nursing Program</b>	<b>% Schools</b>
Simulation training	78.3%
Use of adjunct faculty	70.0%
Grants <sup>‡</sup>	66.7%
Evening schedule	40.0%
Weekend schedule	34.2%
Distance Education (e.g. online, interactive video)	23.3%
Accelerated/ year-round program	19.2%
Extended campuses	12.5%
Shared faculty	11.7%
Part-time program	6.7%
Joint faculty	4.2%
Other	5.8%
None	4.2%
Number of schools	120

<sup>‡</sup> Data were collected for the first time in the 2009-2010 survey.

*Access to Prerequisite Courses*

- 50 nursing schools reported that access to prerequisite science and general education courses is a problem for their pre-licensure nursing students.
- Adding science course sections and agreements with other schools for prerequisite courses were reported as the most common methods used to increase access to prerequisite courses for these students.

<b>Prerequisite Access for Pre-Nursing Students</b>	<b>% Schools</b>
Adding science course sections	54%
Agreements with other schools for prerequisite courses	48%
Offering additional prerequisite courses on weekends, evenings, and summers	36%
Accepting online courses from other institutions	36%
Providing online courses	22%
Transferable high school courses to achieve prerequisites	8%
Prerequisite courses in adult education	4%
Other	8%
Number of schools	50

*Restricting Student Access to Clinical Practice<sup>‡</sup>*

- 94 nursing schools reported that pre-licensure students in their programs had encountered restrictions to clinical practice imposed on them by clinical facilities.
- The most common types of restricted access students faced were to the clinical site itself, due to a visit from the Joint Commission or another accrediting agency, access to electronic medical records, and bar coding medication administration.
- Schools reported that it was uncommon to have students face the following types of restrictions: direct communication with health care team members, access to alternative settings due to liability issues, use of glucometers, and IV medication administration.

Type of Restricted Access	Percentage of Schools (%)					# Schools
	Very Uncommon	Uncommon	Common	Very Common	N/A	
Bar coding medication administration	8.5%	17.0%	39.4%	30.9%	4.3%	94
Electronic Medical Records	7.5%	19.2%	39.4%	30.9%	3.2%	94
Glucometers	21.1%	34.4%	18.9%	20.0%	5.6%	90
Automated medical supply cabinets	10.8%	21.5%	30.0%	23.7%	16.1%	93
IV medication administration	20.7%	44.6%	16.3%	12.0%	6.5%	92
Clinical site due to visit from accrediting agency (Joint Commission)	6.5%	22.8%	34.8%	34.8%	1.1%	92
Direct communication with health team	36.6%	45.2%	6.5%	5.4%	6.5%	93
Alternative setting due to liability	28.6%	30.8%	13.2%	7.7%	19.8%	91

<sup>‡</sup> Data describing access to clinical practice being restricted and the areas affected were collected for the first time in the 2009-2010 survey.

- The most common clinical practice areas in which students faced restrictions were Medical Surgical, Pediatrics, and Obstetrics.<sup>‡</sup>

Clinical Area of Restricted Access	% Schools
Medical/Surgical	94.6%
Pediatrics	76.1%
Obstetrics	71.7%
Critical Care	64.1%
Psychiatry/Mental Health	50.0%
Geriatrics	29.3%
Community Health	14.1%
Number of schools	94

#### *Donations to the Nursing Program*

- On average, schools reported that just over 70% of funding for their nursing programs comes from the operating budget of their college or university, while approximately 25% of funding comes from government sources.

<b>Donations to the Nursing Program</b>	% Schools
Your college/university operating budget	72.1%
Government (i.e. federal grants, state grants, Chancellor's Office, Federal Workforce Investment Act)	23.6%
Industry (i.e. hospitals, health systems)	9.0%
Foundations, private donors	5.4%
Other	10.0%
Number of schools	117

#### *RN Refresher Course*

- In 2009-2010, nine nursing schools offered an RN refresher course, and 213 students completed one of these courses.

---

<sup>‡</sup> Data describing access to clinical practice being restricted and the areas affected were collected for the first time in the 2009-2010 survey.



*Employment of Recent Nursing Program Graduates*

- The average proportion of students who completed a nursing program between 8/1/09 and 7/31/10 are employed in a hospital is 59%.
- The average proportion of students who completed a nursing program between 8/1/09 and 7/31/10 who are unable to find employment in nursing is 27.5%.
- On average, 81.1% of recent graduates who are currently employed work in California.

<b>Employment Location</b>	<b>Average % of Program Graduates</b>
Hospitals	59.0%
Long term care facilities	9.7%
Community/public health facilities	3.9%
Other healthcare facilities	6.0%
Other	14.8%
Unable to find employment <sup>‡</sup>	27.5%
Number of schools	109

*Clinical Simulation Center*

- 116 nursing schools used a clinical simulation center between 8/1/09 and 7/31/10
- 71.6% (n=83) of schools that use a clinical simulation center have plans to expand the center.
- Clinical scenarios, debriefing and dialoguing, hi-fidelity mannequins, students in uniform, and a student preparation phase are all very common educational techniques used as part of the clinical simulation experience.

<b>Educational Techniques of Clinical Simulation</b>	<b>% Schools</b>
Clinical scenarios	100%
Debriefing and dialoguing as part of the simulation experience	93.0%
Hi-fidelity mannequin	91.3%
Students in uniforms	91.3%
A student preparation phase as part of the simulation experience	87.0%
Videotaping	63.5%
Enclosed simulation room replicating the clinical environment with observation window(s)	58.3%
Number of schools	116

---

<sup>‡</sup> Data were collected for the first time in the 2009-2010 survey.

- Over 90% of schools that use a clinical simulation have facilities on campus at the nursing school.

<b>Location of Clinical Simulation</b>	<b>% Schools</b>
On campus at the nursing school	93.0%
Through arrangement at another facility (i.e. clinical affiliate, nursing program)	14.8%
Other	4.4%
Number of schools	116

- Schools most frequently staff clinical simulation with full-time or part-time staff, or a clinical simulation coordinator.

<b>Staffing Clinical Simulation</b>	<b>% Schools</b>
Full-time or part-time staff	68.4%
RN clinical simulation coordinator (in addition to RN course faculty)	63.2%
Clinical simulation technician	36.8%
Other	12.2%
Number of schools	115

- The most frequently reported reasons for using a clinical simulation center were to provide clinical experience not available in a clinical setting (85.1%), to standardize clinical experiences (82.5%), and to check clinical competencies (80.7%),.

<b>Use of a Clinical Simulation Center</b>	<b>% Schools</b>
To provide clinical experience not available in a clinical setting	85.1%
To standardize clinical experiences	82.5%
To check clinical competencies	80.7%
To make up for clinical experiences	62.2%
To provide interdisciplinary experiences	27.2%
To increase capacity in your nursing program	13.8%
To provide collaborative experiences between hospital staff and students	7.9%
Number of schools	115

- Most hi-fidelity scenarios used in California nursing schools are developed by faculty, purchased, or modified from purchased scenarios.
- More than one-quarter (27%) of hi-fidelity scenarios are developed through participation in regional or statewide alliances.

<b>Development of Hi-Fidelity Scenarios</b>	<b>% Schools</b>
By faculty	81.7%
Purchased	67.8%
Modified from purchased scenarios	60.0%
Regional or statewide alliance <sup>‡</sup>	27.0%
Shared with another nursing program	13.9%
Other	3.5%
Number of schools	116

- Medical/Surgical, pediatrics, obstetrics and fundamentals are the most common areas in which schools use clinical simulation.
- On average, nursing schools use clinical simulation centers for 13% of clinical time in medical/surgical and 12% of clinical time in fundamentals.

<b>Content Areas Taught in the Clinical Simulation Center</b>	<b>% Schools</b>	<b>Average % of Content Taught in Simulation</b>
Medical/Surgical	98.3%	13.3%
Pediatrics	80.7%	10.9%
Obstetrics	80.7%	10.3%
Fundamentals	76.3%	12.3%
Geriatrics	58.8%	7.6%
Psychiatry/Mental Health	36.0%	5.0%
Leadership/Management	30.7%	5.7%
Other	5.3%	13.9%
Number of schools	114	109

---

<sup>‡</sup> Data were collected for the first time in the 2009-2010 survey.

## APPENDICES

### APPENDIX A – List of Survey Respondents by Degree Program

#### *ADN Programs (77)*

American River College	Los Angeles Southwest College
Antelope Valley College	Los Angeles Trade-Tech College
Bakersfield College	Los Angeles Valley College
Butte Community College	Los Medanos College
Cabrillo College	Mendocino College
Cerritos College	Merced College
Chabot College	Merritt College
Chaffey College	Mira Costa College ( <i>formerly LVN to ADN</i> )
Citrus College	Modesto Junior College
City College of San Francisco	Monterey Peninsula College
College of Marin	Moorpark College
College of San Mateo	Mount Saint Mary's College
College of the Canyons	Mount San Antonio College
College of the Desert	Mount San Jacinto College
College of the Redwoods	Napa Valley College
College of the Sequoias	Ohlone College
Contra Costa College	Pacific Union College
Copper Mountain College	Palomar College
Cuesta College	Pasadena City College
Cypress College	Rio Hondo College
De Anza College	Riverside Community College
East Los Angeles College	Sacramento City College
El Camino College - Compton Education Center	Saddleback College
El Camino College	San Bernardino Valley College
Everest College	San Diego City College
Evergreen Valley College	San Joaquin Delta College
Fresno City College	San Joaquin Valley College
Glendale Community College	Santa Ana College
Golden West College	Santa Barbara City College
Grossmont College	Santa Monica College
Hartnell College	Santa Rosa Junior College
Imperial Valley College	Shasta College
Kaplan College ( <i>formerly Maric College</i> )	Sierra College
Long Beach City College	Solano Community College
Los Angeles City College	Southwestern College
Los Angeles County College of Nursing & Allied Health	Ventura College
Los Angeles Harbor College	Victor Valley College
Los Angeles Pierce College	West Hills College Lemoore
	Yuba College

*LVN to ADN Programs Only (9)*

Allan Hancock College  
Carrington College  
(formerly *Western Career College – Sacramento*)  
College of the Siskiyous  
Gavilan College

Mission College  
Unitek College  
West Coast University – Inland Empire  
West Coast University – Los Angeles  
West Coast University – Orange

*BSN Programs (37)*

American University of Health Sciences  
Azusa Pacific University  
Biola University  
California Baptist University  
Concordia University Irvine  
CSU Bakersfield  
CSU Channel Islands  
CSU Chico  
CSU East Bay  
CSU Fresno  
CSU Fullerton  
CSU Long Beach  
CSU Los Angeles  
CSU Northridge  
CSU Sacramento  
CSU San Bernardino  
CSU San Marcos  
CSU Stanislaus  
Dominican University of California

Humboldt State University  
Loma Linda University  
Mount Saint Mary's College  
National University  
Point Loma Nazarene University  
Samuel Merritt University  
San Diego State University  
San Francisco State University  
San Jose State University  
Sonoma State University  
University of California Irvine  
University of California Los Angeles  
University of Phoenix - Northern California  
University of San Francisco  
West Coast University – Inland Empire  
\* West Coast University – Los Angeles  
West Coast University – Orange County  
Western Governors University

*ELM Programs (16)*

Azusa Pacific University  
California Baptist University  
CSU Dominguez Hills  
CSU Fresno  
CSU Fullerton  
CSU Long Beach  
CSU Los Angeles  
United States University  
(formerly *InterAmerican College*)

Samuel Merritt University  
San Francisco State University  
Sonoma State University  
University of California Los Angeles  
University of California San Francisco  
University of San Diego  
University of San Francisco  
Western University of Health Sciences

\* - New programs in 2009-2010

## APPENDIX B – Definition List

### **Definition List**

The following definitions apply throughout the survey whenever the word or phrase being defined appears unless otherwise noted.

**Accelerated Program:** An Accelerated Program's curriculum extends over a shorter time-period than a traditional program. The curriculum itself may be the same as a generic curriculum or it may be designed meet the unique learning needs of the student population.

**Active Faculty:** A faculty member that has a current teaching assignment or faculty role. Do not include those on leave or those that do not have a current assignment.

**Adjunct Faculty:** A faculty member that is employed to teach a course in a part-time and/or temporary capacity.

**Advanced Placement Students:** Pre-licensure students who entered the nursing program in the second semester/quarter or in a higher level nursing course. This group includes LVNs and other health care providers, but does not include transfer students or readmitted students.

**Assembly Bill 1559 Criteria:** Requires California Community College (CCC) districts to adopt and implement merit-based admissions policies for nursing programs if, for any academic term, there are more applicants seeking enrollment in that program than may reasonably be accommodated. Criteria include (1) academic degrees, diplomas, or relevant certificates held by an applicant, (2) GPA in relevant course work, (3) any relevant work or volunteer experience, (4) life experiences or special circumstances including but not limited to: disabilities, low family income, 1st generation of family to attend college, need to work, disadvantaged social or educational environment, difficult personal and family situations or circumstances, refugee or veteran status, and (5) additional criteria such as personal interview, a personal statement, letter of recommendation, or the number of repetitions of prerequisite classes or other criteria, as approved by the chancellor.

**Attrition Rate:** The total number of generic students dropped or disqualified who were scheduled to complete the program between August 1, 2008 and July 31, 2009, divided by the total number of generic students enrolled who were scheduled to complete during the same time period.

**Census Data:** Number of students enrolled or faculty present on October 15, 2009.

**Clinical Simulation Center/Experience:** Clinical simulation provides a simulated real-time nursing care experience using clinical scenarios and low to hi-fidelity mannequins, which allow students to integrate, apply, and refine specific skills and abilities that are based on theoretical concepts and scientific knowledge. It may include videotaping, de-briefing and dialogue as part of the learning process.

## APPENDIX B – Definition List

**Collaborative/Shared Education:** A written agreement between two or more nursing programs specifying the nursing courses at their respective institutions that are equivalent and acceptable for transfer credit to partner nursing programs. These partnerships may be between nursing programs offering the same degree or between an entry degree nursing program(s) and a higher degree nursing program(s). These later arrangements allow students to progress from one level of nursing education to a higher level without the repetition of nursing courses.

**Completed on Schedule Students:** Students scheduled on admission to complete the program between August 1, 2008 and July 31, 2009.

**Contract Education:** A written agreement between a nursing program and a health care organization in which the nursing program agrees to provide a nursing degree program for the organization's employees for a fee.

**Distance Education:** Any method of presenting a course where the student and teacher are not present in the same room (e.g., internet web based, teleconferencing, etc.).

**Entry-level Master's (ELM):** A master's degree program in nursing for students who have earned a bachelor's degree in a discipline other than nursing and do not have prior schooling in nursing. This program consists of pre-licensure nursing courses and master's level nursing courses.

**Evening Program:** A program that offers all program activities in the evening (i.e. lectures, etc.). This does not include a traditional program that offers evening clinical rotations.

**Hi-Fidelity Mannequin:** A portable, realistic human patient simulator designed to teach and test students' clinical and decision-making skills.

**Full-time:** More than 20 hours per week

**Generic Pre-licensure Students:** Students who enter the program in the first nursing course.

**Joint Faculty:** Nurses employed by the health care agency who also have a faculty appointment at the school.

**LVN to BSN Program:** A program that exclusively admits LVN to BSN students. If the school also has a generic BSN program, the LVN to BSN program is offered separately or differs significantly from the generic program.

**LVN 30 Unit Option Students:** LVNs enrolled in the curriculum for the 30-unit option.

**Part-time:** 20 hours or less per week.

**Pre-nursing Students:** Students who are enrolled in or have completed nursing prerequisites on your campus and intend to apply to your nursing program.

**Readmitted Students:** Returning students who were previously enrolled in your program.

**Retention Rate:** The total number of generic students who completed the program between August 1, 2008 and July 31, 2009 divided by the total number of generic students enrolled who were scheduled to complete during the same time period.

## **APPENDIX B – Definition List**

**Shared Faculty:** A faculty member is shared by more than one school, e.g. one faculty member teaches a course in pediatrics to three different schools in one region.

**Students Behind Schedule:** Students who were scheduled to complete the program between August 1, 2008 and July 31, 2009 that are still enrolled in the program.

**Students who Dropped Out or were Disqualified:** Students who have left the program prior to their scheduled completion date occurring between August 1, 2008 and July 31, 2009.

**Time Period for the Survey:** August 1, 2008 - July 31, 2009. For those schools that admit multiple times a year, combine all student cohorts.

**Traditional Program:** A program on the semester or quarter system that offers most courses and other required program activities on weekdays during business hours. Clinical rotations for this program may be offered on evenings and weekends.

**Transfer Students:** Students in your programs that have transferred nursing credits from another pre-licensure program. This excludes RN to BSN students.

**Validated Prerequisites:** The nursing program uses one of the options provided by the California Community College Chancellor's Office for validating prerequisite courses.

**Waiting List:** A waiting list identifies students who qualified for the program, were not admitted in the enrollment cycle for which they applied, and will be considered for a subsequent enrollment cycle without needing to reapply.

**Weekend Program:** A program that offers all program activities on weekends, i.e. lectures, clinical rotations, etc. This does not include a traditional program that offers clinical rotations on weekends.



## **APPENDIX C – BRN Education Advisory Committee Members**

### **BRN Education Advisory Committee Members**

#### **Members**

Loucine Huckabay, Chair  
Sue Albert  
Audrey Berman  
Liz Close  
Patricia Girczyc  
Marilyn Herrmann  
Deloras Jones  
Stephanie Leach  
Tammy Rice, MSN, RN  
Scott R. Ziehm, ND, RN

#### **Organization**

California State University, Long Beach  
College of the Canyons  
Samuel Merritt University  
Sonoma State University  
College of the Redwoods  
Loma Linda University  
California Institute of Nursing and Health Care  
formerly with California Community College Chancellor's Office  
Saddleback College  
University of California, San Francisco

#### **Ex-Officio Members**

Louise Bailey                      California Board of Registered Nursing

#### **Project Managers**

Carol Mackay                      California Board of Registered Nursing  
Julie Campbell-Warnock              California Board of Registered Nursing